

We are talking about a program that is due to expire now when the weather is starting to turn good across this country, when people are looking with some type of hope to the new type of economy which we have promised them and the hope with which this weather brings to young couples who would like to perhaps own their first home. I think if we do anything to help boost the housing industry, which provides so many jobs and provides so much of this economy, we would be doing a great thing ultimately for the architect of this economic recovery plan, and I urge this Congress to pass this bill and extend this expiration date so that we can now have new housing starts across this country and give hope to those who one day, long to be homeowners.

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, the severity of this past winter which fortunately ended on March 20—is the best argument I can make to my fellow Members to vote for this greatly needed extension of the National Housing Act. The winter was harsh, even for Massachusetts, which requires hardness in every year.

But familiarity does not mean we in Massachusetts or New England were—or are—prepared to deal with some of the adverse economic consequences. The housing industry in Massachusetts was particularly hard hit, as was the housing industry across the country.

Moreover, the delay in getting new housing construction underway will fall even more heavily on low-income people who had qualified for interest subsidies under section 235.

A "yea" on this measure is the only responsible way to respond to these weather and market conditions, which could not have been foreseen when the reconciliation vote was taken last summer. A "yea" vote on this measure means that work will go forward on upwards of 9,000 homes this coming June—the anniversary of the original reconciliation vote—providing work for builders, carpenters, plumbers, masons, and, of course, needed homes for families.

With the homebuilding industry in a crippled state, due to high interest rates and other factors, this bill is needed as a boost, not a crutch.●

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support to that of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, my colleague from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) in urging the House to move expeditiously to approve H.R. 5708. This bill would extend the section 235 homeownership assistance program which is due to expire March 31 of this year to September 30 of this year.

Until 2 years ago, the section 235 homeownership program, which provides interest subsidies to people up to 95 percent of area median income to assist them in achieving homeownership, was a little used program. En-

acted as part of the landmark Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the use of the program has been quite extensive in the last 2 years because of the poor conditions in the homebuilding industry. In many parts of the country, the section 235 program is the only program that is enabling homebuilders to keep their heads above the waters of financial bankruptcy. Because of provisions enacted as part of the Gramm-Latta substitute to the Reconciliation Act of last year, the Congress was forced to accept an early termination of this program. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the demonstrated need for Federal programs such as this one that sustains the homebuilding industry.

H.R. 5008 has widespread support from the housing industry and from Members on both sides of the aisle. I am pleased that we have the cooperation of the distinguished ranking minority member, my colleague from Ohio, BILL STANTON's, support for the prompt enactment of this bill.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5708, legislation to extend the Federal Government's section 235 homeownership assistance program through the end of the current fiscal year of 1982.

The passage of the legislation before us under suspension of the rules is a relatively simple one, but one exceedingly important at a time when soaring interest rates and inflation is placing the American dream of homeownership in serious trouble.

By extending the section 235 homeownership assistance program beyond the March 31, 1982, expiration date through September 30, 1982, the House of Representatives can send a signal out to the homebuilding and construction industry that we want to keep alive a valuable Federal program that can assist them in selling houses.

On the national level, there are 8,000 reservations pending under section 235 at this point and, if the program is not extended, all of these units will be lost.

As Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, during the past several years, I have witnessed the dramatic slowdown in the homebuilding and construction industry on the national level and in our own island.

Fortunately, the Housing Subcommittee chaired by Congressman GONZALEZ has given every indication that it is working hard to resolve this situation, and to restore subsidized housing programs of the Federal Government so important to our local economy.

In Puerto Rico, I am informed that we have 239 housing units still being processed which could conceivably be lost if this legislation is not passed and, for that reason, this bill has my strong support.

Of this total, 150 units belong to an impressive development in the financial center of urban San Juan and the San Juan New Center, a core area in need of new housing units to solve re-

location problems and to stimulate the economy in that sector of Puerto Rico.

Although no applications are pending due to the fact that no funds are available for new starts at the present time, these projects are still considered in the pipeline, being slowed down somewhat by high interest rates and the need to come up with additional financing even though the federally subsidized low interest rates are exceedingly helpful in a time of national slowdown in new housing starts.

I urge the passage of this legislation and support H.R. 5708.●

Mr. STANTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5708.

The question was taken.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5708.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY ALTERNATIVE WORK SCHEDULE EXTENSION

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2254) to temporarily extend the authority to conduct experiments in flexible schedules and compressed schedules under the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1978.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2254

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking out "over a 3-year period" in the first sentence of section 2;

(2) by striking out "the end of the 3-year period which begins on the effective date of this title" in section 102(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "the first day of the second pay period beginning after July 4, 1982"; and

(3) by striking out "the end of the 3-year period which begins on the effective date of this title" in section 202(d) and inserting in lieu thereof "the first day of the second pay period beginning after July 4, 1982."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

March 23, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

gages for families that do not have sufficient income to make payments on loans at current market rates. This subsidy is recaptured at the time the home is sold. This program is the only hope that a vast number of families with modest income have of ever being able to afford a home. It is also, in today's markets, one of the very few ways that builders have to make homes affordable and therefore sellable.

The building industry right now is at the depths of its longest and most severe crisis since the Great Depression. Housing starts at the present time are at less than a 1 million unit per year level—and this level is at least 1 million units less than the total demand. Put very simply, the demand is there, but the housing cannot be built because interest rates are too high for anyone—builder or buyer—to afford. Less than 10 percent of the people of this country today can afford to qualify for an average priced home. In my own hometown of San Antonio, for example, where housing costs are less than the national average, the typical home is priced at \$50,000 or so, but monthly payments are about \$820. To cover a mortgage, the buyer has to have an income of about \$45,000 a year—which is twice what the average income of residents in my city earn.

With the housing industry in a state of depression, programs like section 235 represent a lifeline. What this bill does is simply to keep presently authorized housing units available for construction.

There are about 8,000 housing units that can be built if this bill is passed. Without the bill, those homes will simply not get built.

There is no additional cost to the Government to pass this bill; the funds have been authorized, and appropriations provided, for this program. The only purpose of the bill is to extend the deadline by which builders must complete their processing.

I do not believe this is a matter that should involve any controversy; it is a simple measure to enable the housing industry to maintain a little thread of help, a simple action to insure that the housing units that Congress intended to be built in this fiscal year actually do get built.

This bill has support on both sides of the aisle, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize the critical need for this extension, I think the best thing I can do is to read into the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from the president of the National Association of Home Builders, Mr. Fred Napolitano, dated March 22, 1982:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

OF HOME BUILDERS,

Washington, D.C., March 22, 1982.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and
Community Development, Committee on
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washing-
ton, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GONZALEZ: On behalf of the more than 114,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders I would like to urge immediate action on H.R. 5708, your bill to extend the Section 235 program through the end of Fiscal Year 1982.

As you know, the current authorization expires on March 31, thereby creating the need for an immediate extension. The bill you have introduced will accomplish this goal without providing any additional funding. Rather, it will assure that thousands of lower-income homebuyers will not lose the opportunity for homeownership provided under this program.

Current delays in construction can be attributed to a variety of uncontrollable factors, including harsh winter weather, delay in processing and buyer cancellations due to economic hardship. At a time when many builders are barely hanging on and depending upon commitments under this program to remain in business, immediate action on this bill is essential.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud your efforts to assure a rapid solution to this problem. I am hopeful that the full House will adopt this noncontroversial bill without delay.

Sincerely,

FRED NAPOLITANO,

President.

Mr. STANTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 5708. This legislation would extend until the end of the fiscal year the basic section 235 program.

The Reconciliation Act prohibits the Secretary from entering into new contracts for assistance payments under section 235 after March 31. There are a few exceptions to this, but basically it was our intention to let the program lapse as of that date.

There are two reasons to support a 6-month extension. As everyone in this Chamber knows, this has been an extremely harsh winter. In many sections of the country it was impossible for builders to move forward under the program. It would have been necessary to have reached the firm commitment stage which means a construction start.

The second reason is that there is no new money involved in extending the program. These funds have already been authorized and appropriated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 5708.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Delaware. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5708, the National Housing Act extension. Without this bill, the authority for HUD to enter into new contracts for the section 235 program—which provides homeownership assistance to low- and moderate-

income families—is scheduled to expire at the end of this month. With the bill, this authority would extend through September 30, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's comprehensive economic program is fundamentally sound. However, in order to be successful, it must be perceived as fair. Equity must exist in the program if it is to be allowed the opportunity to work, and our decision on programs such as the one before us today will determine how a large number of Americans view this plan. The Federal deficit must be narrowed, but not in a way that is counterproductive to the goals of the program itself. No one segment of our population should be singled out to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of fighting high interest rates, unemployment, and inflation.

The extraordinarily bad weather that has been experienced this winter in my own home State of Delaware, as well as in most other States across the Nation, is undoubtedly a factor in the inability of homebuilders to meet the March 31 deadline. Surely, this is the worst possible time to withhold assistance—the mechanism for which is already in place and the funds for which have already been authorized and appropriated—from that portion of our population among the hardest hit by this recession.

Without this bill, the already limited opportunity for homeownership by low- and middle-income Americans will be further reduced. That is why I support this legislation. There are far better places to exercise restraint to achieve the much-needed reduction in our Federal deficit. We must focus attention on curbing and eliminating programs that provide assistance to those who do not legitimately need help, rather than on programs such as this.

In the interest of fairness, we should extend the time limit for HUD to enter into contracts under the section 235 program. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

□ 1500

Mr. STANTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our friend, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. HARTNETT).

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the passage of this extension. As my colleagues know, the housing industry, which has suffered tremendously in this time of economic recovery, I think, deserves to have whatever little shot in the arm we as Members of Congress can give to it.

One of the largest indicators of how the economy of this country is going is housing starts. We are talking about an extension for which, as our good friend from Delaware has said, funds have been authorized and they have already been approved and appropriated.

March 23, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1041

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO).

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 1978, the Congress authorized Public Law 95-390 a 3-year experiment for Federal agencies on the use of alternatives to the traditional fixed schedule 8-hour workday. Since then, more than 325,000 Federal employees in 1,500 organizations have taken part in this successful experiment. If we do not act today and pass legislation to extend this program, alternative work schedules in the Federal Government will expire in less than one week.

The legislation we are considering, S. 2254, merely extends the authority for the current experiment until the beginning of the second pay period following July 4. This emergency legislation was considered by unanimous consent yesterday in the Senate and passed without objection. I regret having to ask the House to enact legislation on an emergency basis, but not only will it cost taxpayers millions of dollars if we do not enact this legislation today, but the Federal work force will be disrupted. Allowing termination of this program, which the Office of Personnel Management found to be "successful in most situations from the perspective of experimenting organizations and individuals" would truly be a disaster.

I will not recount all the benefits of this program except to say that it is a no cost, morale boosting, productivity increasing, service improving program. I do, however, feel compelled to recount the actions of the administration in dealing with this matter which have placed us in this position today. The law establishing the 3-year experiment required the administration to submit an interim report and legislative proposals by September 30 of last year. I had scheduled hearings last October so that Congress could consider AWS in a rational and timely manner. Unfortunately, those hearings had to be canceled because the administration did not submit the report or the legislative proposals mandated by law. Finally, in November OPM submitted an interim report which found the program to be successful. However, the administration did not submit the required legislative recommendations.

After becoming convinced that the administration was not going to act, I introduced legislation in January which would continue the provisions of the current successful program. At

hearings before my subcommittee, the administration was not able to present a single incidence of problems in the program which could not be corrected under the existing program or the legislation which I had introduced. Despite that fact, the administration consistently refused to support my legislation although they had not sent up an alternative plan. On the day after my bill, H.R. 5366, was reported from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee without a single negative vote, the administration finally sent up their legislative proposal.

The administration proposal would have effectively ended alternative work schedules in the Federal Government. The administration would require a determination prior to the implementation of an alternative work schedule that it would, first, improve productivity or provide greater service to the public, and second, not add to the cost of agency operations. This is clearly an impossible task. In addition, the administration proposal would make AWS a unilateral management right and would take away rights of Federal employees and their representatives granted by this Congress in the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. To this day, no member of this body has introduced that legislation.

On March 2 this House voted 255 to 142 in favor of H.R. 5366, the legislation which I introduced to permanently authorize the program. Unfortunately, that was not a sufficient vote to suspend the rules and pass the legislation. Since that time I and others have been attempting to negotiate with all interested parties so that this important program would be able to continue. When it became clear that a compromise was not likely to be reached the chairman of the authorizing committee in the other body introduced this legislation to give all parties more time to work out a compromise.

The legislation which we are now considering is the same legislation which was passed by the other body yesterday. I am sorry to have to tell this House that the administration will not support this simple extension. I must say that I do not understand their opposition.

The intent of this bill is simple. It would continue the current program for approximately 4 months. Any experimental flexible or compressed work schedule program established under the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. 6101 note) in effect on March 28, 1982, will not terminate by reason of: First, section 102(c) or section 292(d) of the 1978 act, as those sections were in effect prior to the amendments made by S. 2254; or second, the provisions of any collective bargaining agreement or experiment under the 1978 act which are based on section 102(c) or section 202(d). It is important that these programs continue so that the cost of irresponsible ter-

mination not be borne by the American public.

The termination date of this extension was selected by the Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the authorizing committee in the other body. I do not intend to wait until July to ask this House to again consider permanent legislation. At a time when Federal employee morale is at an all time low level, when we are asking Federal workers to work harder for less pay, to do more with fewer people, I urge this House not to permit this no cost program which is so important to Federal employee morale to lapse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), chairman of the Appropriations Committee for a unanimous-consent request.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON A BILL MAKING URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1982

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

MAKING IN ORDER ON TOMORROW OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 409

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow or any day thereafter to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 409) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1982.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that we have seen the latest edition of the Whitten-Conte show, to bring us back to reality, I yield 3 minutes to the champion of Federal employees, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS).

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the adoption of this legislation S. 2254 which would extend the Federal employees flexible and compressed work week for 120 days. A few short weeks ago, the House failed to pass H.R. 5366, under suspension of the rules although 255 Members, a clear majority, voted for it. As a result, the flexitime program will expire next Monday unless we take action immediately.

I have been working with Senator TED STEVENS on this matter and requested him to offer an amendment in the other body that would extend the flexitime program until we could work

H 1042

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 23, 1982

out a more permanent agreement. Yesterday afternoon, Senator STEVENS offered an amendment which would extend flexitime for 120 days. That amendment was unanimously approved by the Senate. We now have the opportunity to show the support of the House for flexitime by approving this extension.

I have talked with the Office of Personnel Management on several occasions the past few days urging their support for this legislation. All we are asking for is a simple extension of a very important program. The extension is not permanent and it does not cost any money. There is absolutely no rational reason why OPM should oppose this extension and it is my hope that they will do so.

Everyone benefits from flexible work schedules. The Federal Government benefits from the program because the increased morale has led to an increase in productivity. The general public benefits because flexible work schedules have increased operational hours and has meant greater accessibility to services being offered by the various agencies.

We are not asking that the Congress take action to make flexitime permanent, we are just asking that Congress allow this program to continue for 120 days so that we can work on a permanent program. When the House considered H.R. 5366, 255 Members voted in favor of the flexitime bill. I am requesting that these Members again show their support by voting for this extension.

□ 1510

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inspiring remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), another great spokesman for Federal employees.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I represent a large number of Federal employees in Virginia's 10th District who have participated in the highly successful experimental work schedule program. I agree with the recent Office of Personnel Management report on the flexitime experiment which recommended that this worthwhile program be continued permanently. Because flexitime works, I have cosponsored legislation which would make permanent the Federal program which allows agencies to use alternative work schedules for employees. However, we are not here today to debate the merits of the permanent legislation. We are acting—and rightly so—to provide a temporary extension of flexitime while we work out a permanent solution to this matter.

I believe the flexitime experiment is worth continuing. I think it is an excellent idea—it shows vision and cre-

ativity in Federal management—and it is people who make it work.

I know a number of people, one in my own office, whose wife works at a particular agency, and could not work if flexitime were not available.

There are many people where one or the other will leave early and the other will go late, so that there is somebody home with the children. Nowhere is there any evaluation of the impact on that 2-year-old child or 5-year-old child or the impact on what it is to be 8 years old and know that your mother or father is there to see you off to school, or that there is somebody there to meet you at the bus.

We have to get away from the nuts and bolts type of thinking and consider the human approach. This does not cost the Government any money and provides high returns in the way of employee productivity and morale.

For the immediate, time is running out on the flexitime program. I urge my colleagues to extend the authority for the current experiment until the administration and Congress can resolve this matter. I am committed to the flexitime way of life. It deserves a new lease on life.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation to extend the flexible and compressed work schedule for another 120 days. Instead of merely passing a stopgap measure to keep a good program from dying, we should be enacting permanent legislation to provide for the continued use of alternative work schedules. Time, however, has run out and the bill before us is the best we can do for the moment.

Let me take a moment to commend the persistence and commitment of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO). She has fought to pass legislation continuing the flexitime program, while it was being attacked from all sides. The administration has nipped every proposal, while belatedly producing its own suggestions which were quickly dismissed as unhelpful by those who know most about Federal flexitime. Some in the business community have unsuccessfully attempted to load an unrelated provision on the bill. There were even those in the labor community who expressed concern about various drafts. Through it all, Ms. FERRARO has pushed to keep flexitime going. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees and millions of taxpayers are in her debt.

When permanent legislation was brought to the floor 3 weeks ago, I discussed the improvement in Government productivity, the increased service to the public, and the heightened morale of Federal employees which has come from the alternative work schedule program. Denver, Colo.,

which I have the honor of representing, has been the primary testing ground for Federal alternative work schedules. I can tell you the program has reduced absenteeism, reduced traffic congestion, and favorably impressed those who deal with the Federal Government.

Since that time, I have learned of the intensity which Federal employees and their families feel about the flexibility provided by alternative work schedule program. My office has been deluged with phone calls and letters asking why there is trouble extending the program. I wish I could explain to them what the administration finds wrong about keeping offices open longer hours and providing greater service to the public. I can not.

Passage of this bill will keep the program going. We still need permanent legislation to assure continuity and predictability to those who use flexitime. Permanent legislation can also guarantee that alternative work schedule programs result in benefits to the Government and the taxpayer. For reasons that have already been explained, it is impossible right now to get permanent legislation enacted. The most prudent course for the moment is to avoid the large costs of closing down flexitime, by continuing the program, and then working to develop a consensus for the program's permanent continuation.

Mr. Speaker, let us not kill a valuable, no-cost, productivity-improving program. Let us pass this extension.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Next Monday, the experimental Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1978 expires. I supported the experiment, and, on the basis of the evidence, support continuation of the program, providing the administration and the Office of Personnel Management have the means to effectively manage and direct the efforts of the Federal work force.

That is a basic management requirement for this administration or any administration in giving priority consideration to the public interest.

I want to emphasize that President Reagan and OPM Director Donald Devine support permanent alternate work schedules in the Federal Government, but only with the proper management safeguards. While the flexitime experiment has been well received by Federal employees, that fact remains that it should not be viewed as an employee convenience. Federal managers should not be precluded from discontinuing work schedules that are not in the public interest.

As I mentioned at the outset, we are in a time bind in dealing with a complicated problem. What we are doing here today is buying some time with a simple 4-month extension of the existing flexitime program. That will give

March 23, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1043

us time to work out an agreement that will give the administration the tools it needs and requires to manage what is a promising and innovative program.

While I am in complete accord with the administration's position, I am supporting the simple extension of the existing program.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentlewoman from New York. I know they have been getting ready for weeks for this fierce battle. I now have to advise them that the OPM has withdrawn all their objections to this bill. They are perfectly pleased to take the 4 months extension.

I would like to think it was because of the pressure applied on this side of the aisle from people like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS).

The point is that they have decided that wisdom and logic are clearly on the side of the extension. The gentlewomen have made a very proper case. Flexitime has worked. It is a good management tool.

In the 4 months left, Senator STEVENS will work with us on the House side to see that we get a proper bill. I commend the gentlewoman from New York for not only her leadership, but her perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 2254, legislation extending the experimental alternative work schedules program through the first day of the second pay period beginning after July 4, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2254, which the Senate passed yesterday, is a simple extension of the current AWS program. If the House does not pass S. 2254, the result is predictable: The alternative work schedule program will terminate on March 29, 1982.

As a long-time supporter of the AWS program and as a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, which has jurisdiction over this issue, I have come to recognize that this program significantly boosts employee morale and contributes to increasing Government efficiency. Indeed, the Office of Personnel Management found that a vast majority of participating supervisors and employees strongly endorse this program.

As you will recall, an effort earlier this month to pass under suspension a permanent authorization of the AWS program was defeated in the House.

While I recognize the concerns the administration previously had with the effort to permanently authorize the AWS programs, I wish to point out to my colleagues, that the measure before us today, is merely a temporary extension of the AWS program. It is my hope that during this extension

period the administration and supporters of this program can reconcile any differences so that what has proved to be a productive program, beneficial to both the Government and to its employees, can continue uninterrupted.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules, and pass S. 2254.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to join my many colleagues who have already stood on the floor congratulating the chairwoman for her perseverance and for her effective representation with respect to this issue.

I think it has been universally said on this floor today that flexitime in the main has proved to be a very positive benefit in terms of productivity, but also from my perspective another very important aspect and that is morale. Probably at no time in the long history of the Federal Government has the morale of the Federal employee been at any lower ebb than it is today.

It is therefore, it seems to me, appropriate that we take this action to recognize the program's effectiveness.

I think the ranking minority member of the Post Office Committee was there at the hearing and there was really nobody, including the representatives of OPM, who said that the program was not in the best interests of the Government. It is true that they have some concerns about it.

I am now very pleased to hear the ranking minority member say that OPM has now decided to not oppose this extension, which will give us time to continue to look at this very positive program. I think it is a program which has proven itself in the trial period and ought to be permanently continued. I was one of those who strongly supported it when it was last on the floor of this House.

I am very hopeful that we will now see the unanimous approval of this extension and that we will be able to work out the permanent authorization for flexitime in the very near future.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTERSON).

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding to me on this occasion to speak for this important legislation. I also commend her leadership in preparing and bringing this bill before us today.

I want to indicate to my colleagues that on the last occasion that we voted on the flexitime issue, I cast a no vote. On the bill today I fully intend to cast an aye vote and I urge all those who did vote no previously to reevaluate their position.

I think the bill has been handled very well. I think that flexitime plans should be made available to employees. This will certainly be of great as-

sistance to working families where both partners work and most particularly in cases where a single parent works and has young children to care for.

I urge each and every person who voted aye last time to vote aye again and those who voted no to change their vote with me, reassessing their point of view and to vote aye today.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JOHNSTON).

□ 1520

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this might well be called the Bureaucrats Are Better Than Real People Act; Extension of 1982, because I just do not understand why those employed in air-conditioned offices on the banks of the Potomac should be allowed the flexibility of their working hours when that same right is denied my millworkers down working in unair-conditioned mills under the Walsh-Healy Act who are making the clothes that these bureaucrats, especially in the armed services, are wearing.

It seems to me that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. Why should our mills and our factories be required to pay overtime after 8 hours? Why should our workers in industry supplying the U.S. Government be forced to work 5 days a week under the Walsh-Healy Act, or their employer forced to assess against the American taxpayer a premium for overtime work when the bureaucrats up here are allowed the privilege of only coming to work 4 days a week, or maybe 3 days under flexitime.

My distinguished colleagues have pointed out what it does for the families of the bureaucrats. Well, I would think the same thing would be true for the families of my millworkers and my factory workers down in North Carolina, and the other factory workers throughout the country, a privilege which is denied their families under Walsh-Healy Act.

My distinguished colleagues have pointed out how it enhances productivity. Well, should the taxpayers of America not be entitled to the same enhanced productivity in the defense contracts which are now restricted under Walsh-Healy and the Contract Work Hours Act?

Morale. Do you not think workers in the private sector now on 3-day weeks and 3-week months are suffering from lack of moral? Should not they, too, enjoy the wonderful world of flexitime? But all of this is denied them under Walsh-Healy.

I wonder if my distinguished colleagues would be willing to provide the private sector the same flexibility that they are so interested in providing the bureaucratic sector by repealing the

H 1044

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 23, 1982

Walsh-Healy Act and letting the private sector simply comply with the Wage and Hour Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina (Mr. HARTNETT).

Mr. HARTNETT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, unlike my colleague, I think this probably ought to be termed the Work As You Wish, Work When You Wish Act of 1982.

You know, it has been said here that the Federal employee is suffering from a tremendous loss of morale. I cannot understand why, Mr. Speaker. He is one of the most highly paid employees in the country. He has more benefits than any employee in any industry located anywhere in this world.

Can you imagine the autoworkers union, which is now negotiating contracts with General Motors and other automobile manufacturers, wanting the same thing? The gentleman who puts the headlights on would have to wait 3 hours for the gentleman who puts the bumper on to finish building the automobile.

And it has got to be said the same of our Federal employees, Mr. Speaker. There must be jobs that are linked to each other where one worker has to withhold what he or she would be doing in order to wait for his or her fellow employee to report to work under the flexitime system.

What about the employee who tells his supervisor that he reported to work at 7, but the supervisor chose not to come in until 10 and has no idea whatsoever whether the employee was there at 7 or not.

Maybe it is working well for the employee, but that employee is supposed to be working well for his employer, which is the taxpayers of this country. I think we are entitled to restore some discipline among our workers for the Federal Government, and some productivity. It is time that we exercised some self-control and let the American taxpayer know that his employees, the Federal Government's employees, were on the job every morning at a specified hour and did not retire in the evening until a specified hour.

If it would create some traffic jams, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York, perhaps she would want to decentralize some of this Federal Government and send some of it to South Carolina, where we have no problems with traffic jams whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are doing a terrific injustice to our employers, the people who employ us, the taxpayers of this country, to let them permit their employees to come to work when they wish and work as long as they wish.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the last gentleman speak, I was reminded some of the cars I have seen in the past come out of Detroit looking as though the person with the bumper had to wait 3 hours for the person with the headlight. Hopefully we are addressing those problems in those negotiations going on now.

I rise to come down in between what I have been hearing from both sides today. I happen to think the concept of flexitime does make sense. I think that it can improve productivity. But to suggest there have not been problems is to close your eyes to the reality of what has occurred in the Federal Government in some specific instances.

I cited when I spoke against the permanent extension that came before us some weeks ago the problem that we have seen with the Department of Labor, I referred to the article that appeared in the Washington Post on the subject, the allegations of which have not been contradicted, at least to my satisfaction.

Just yesterday I had an opportunity to speak with an employee of the Labor Department, a long-time member of the other party, who uses flexitime and feels that it does help him with time with his family. But he also told me that, in his opinion, the taxpayer is being ripped off at the present time with the abuses of flexitime that have crept up in certain parts of the Department of Labor.

I would suggest that what the administration has spoken about is the ability to give management those tools necessary to make sure that those abuses do not continue to occur and are not more widespread than those in the experimental program. That is all they are asking. I am sorry that we do not have a bill here that takes care of those problems.

When we were here 3 weeks ago, we were told that flexitime was emergency legislation and had to be passed on the suspension calendar with no opportunity for amendment. But we have had 3 weeks now. We have been here on the floor. We have had time to work on it. But, no, we have not used that chance to have this bill come before us because we have been dealing with such weighty things as the Hoboken Pier bill.

It seems to me we have got to get involved with these issues, and we have got to quit pushing them off.

We have reached a compromise between the administration and those that support a simple extension on a permanent basis of flexitime; hopefully in the next 4 months we can achieve what many of us seek, the concept of flexitime with the recognition that there are some severe problems and the recognition that when an administration comes into power, they deal on the management side. They have been elected by the American people to manage this Government from the executive branch. The Federal workers

have not been given that mandate. They are to cooperate with management. And to the extent that we take out of the hands of the elected representatives of the people, the President of the United States and his administration, the ability to make those decisions that they must make in order to have a fully functioning, efficient Government, we make a mistake.

I would hope that we would keep that in mind. I think it would be very difficult for us to go home to our districts having a simple permanent extension of this bill, as was suggested a few years ago, without dealing with some of the real problems that do exist in the experimental programs of flexitime.

This bill is a good compromise at this time, but let us not fool the American people and say that flexitime is a panacea and that it does not have some problems. It does have some problems. These are real problems. The fact that in 3 weeks we have not been able to reach an adequate compromise on a permanent basis suggests that those problems are difficult and they must be addressed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I had not really intended to take part in this debate, but yesterday, as a member of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, we held hearings in Memphis, Tenn., concerning the veterans' hospitals in that area and throughout the State of Tennessee, and the top people from those installations appeared before us.

Among other things, I do recall late in the morning a question was asked about this type of proceeding. To my surprise, the responses were negative. Basically, what we were told, at least so far as our group was concerned, it did not improve their productivity and it presented a great number of problems for the managers in managing the facilities, and particularly when it was necessary to bring groups of employees together. I suppose that would be comparable to the time the gentleman talked about the operation of an assembly procedure. But when it was necessary to have conferences and meetings, sometimes Joe Doe or Jane Smith just wasn't there because they were on the flexitime program and it was extremely difficult for managers to program work schedules and to make them work as they had been working before.

So on the basis of what I heard yesterday, I do not believe I can support the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, people who support this bill are voting for a two-tier system of employment rules and regulations for this country, one in favor

March 23, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1045

of the bureaucrats and the other against the American worker under Walsh-Healy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

□ 1530

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I take just a minute, and this will close up debate on this side, but I would like to clear a few misconceptions.

First, the OPM, speaking for the administration, is in support of this bill. As far as I am concerned, there should be no controversy left unless people want to go beyond the administration position.

Second, let us understand that all we are passing is a simple 4-month extension, nothing else, and in that 4 months, the House and Senate will continue to work to see if we can get a package together that will in turn be acceptable to Dr. Devine, the OMB, and other spokesmen in the administration.

If a solution is reached, we will have no real controversy, a bill in proper form will be passed sometime later in July. If we do not reach an agreement, this act will die at the end of July. So, I would strongly recommend that for the purposes of ongoing negotiation, for the goal that the President, the Director, Mr. Devine, has in administrative reform and administrative responsibility, that we now support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ).

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to compliment her on her efforts to resuscitate flexitime from the imminent death that confronts it if this legislation is not adopted.

I think it is probably fair to say that, if one can use a medical analogy, flexitime is now in the intensive care unit and hope is rapidly fading for its survival. If however, this legislation is adopted extending the experiment for 4 months, there is at least the possibility that a formula can be found which is acceptable to the administration and to the Federal employee unions, which would enable the Congress to continue flexitime on a permanent basis.

I think that, given the fact that this legislation went through the Senate unanimously, I gather, yesterday, that hopefully the House will approve it by a comparably significant margin today. Flexitime may not be perfect—nothing in our world is these days—but I submit that it is the best thing to have hit the Federal Government, at least in terms of its personnel policies,

since they started to serve apple pie in the Federal cafeterias.

This is a program from which virtually everyone who participates benefits, and no one suffers. Over 300,000 Federal employees participated in the flexitime experiment. Ninety percent of those who did participate pronounced themselves satisfied with it. Eighty-five percent of the Federal managers who were responsible for administering the flexitime programs said that it was a productive experiment and that it in no way created any problems for them in terms of their ability to carry out the mission for which they were responsible.

The administration has told us that we could only continue flexitime if it actually results in an improvement or an increase in productivity, and it seems to me that this reverses what ought to be the burden of proof. I think that as long as flexitime can make the job a little bit more attractive for the Federal employees who participate in it, we ought to permit it, so long as it does not result in a decrease in productivity.

Hopefully, if this bill passes today, we will be able to find a way to address the legitimate concerns of the administration, but enable the flexitime program to continue. There is significant and substantial evidence on the record that flexitime has in fact resulted in improvements in productivity; that it has made the lives of a few hundred thousand Federal employees and their families a little bit easier by giving them some flexibility in terms of the hours in which they work, but at the same time it has enabled the taxpayers to make sure that they get a full day's work for a full day's pay. It has also contributed marginally to reducing traffic congestion in cities where there are substantial numbers of Federal employees. In some instances, flexitime has actually extended the number of hours in which Federal agencies are open to the public, without any additional personnel costs.

This is an experiment which has proved itself in a dozen different ways, and it really would be unfortunate if we let it die because of some quintessentially bureaucratic objections which have no relationship to reality.

So, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for giving me the opportunity to speak and to congratulate her for her efforts to keep Federal employees on flexitime. As the father of this program, who introduced the legislation which authorized it a few years ago, I have more than a passing interest in the survival of this little baby, and I appeal to my colleagues to let the program continue so that it does not die on March 29.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to my very good friend, the senior statesman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman would put on his other hat

as a statesman and tell us, in all his travels around the world, if any other countries use flexitime.

Mr. SOLARZ. I have to confess to my very good friend from Illinois that on my various and intermittent trips around the world that I have worked so hard concentrating so hard on the foreign policy problems that I go there to find out about, that I have not had the time to inquire about flexitime. So, I wish I could claim that this was a universal experiment, but the truth is, all I know about is what we have managed to do with it here in the United States.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It is my impression the gentleman really does not travel enough.

Mr. SOLARZ. Well, I would say that coming from my distinguished friend, in light of his recent experiences, I am not sure that is an admonition I want to take to heart.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. I, too, like my colleague from Illinois, would like to correct a few misconceptions that occurred during the final moments of the debate. My colleagues from North Carolina and South Carolina seem to be under the impression that this program is not used in the private sector. As a matter of fact, since the early 1970's an increasing number of private businesses have adopted a variety of flexible work schedules for employees. Today, it is estimated that nearly 10 million full-time workers enjoy flexible work schedules and compressed workweeks. Those variations from the standard fixed schedule, 8-hour workday, evolved as a means of coping with social change, particularly the dramatic increase of women in the work force and a desire on the part of all employees for a better accommodation between their working and personal lives.

The second point made is that Walsh-Healey is not covered in this legislation, for a very good reason. This subcommittee has no jurisdiction over that legislation. We have only jurisdiction over the Federal work force.

On the comment made by my colleague from California that we several weeks ago did bring the bill up, and had hoped to have something by this time, and he indicated his disappointment that we do not, let me also indicate that I am disappointed that we do not have a permanent authorization for this program at this time, but it is not for want or for lack of trying. As a matter of fact, for the past 3½ weeks we have been negotiating with OPM, and the administration has been absolutely intransigent on moving any sort of legislation.

Finally, let me say that I am delighted that OPM has decided at this last minute not to oppose the extension of this legislation for 4 months. I would hope that the two gentlemen mentioned by my colleague from Illinois,

H 1046

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 23, 1982

the gentlemen from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS and Mr. WOLF), will work with their colleagues and the administration so that we do move for permanent authorization of this program in the very near future.

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are now considering, S. 2254, extends until July 29, 1982, the Federal Government's experiment in flexitime. During debate in this Chamber on H.R. 5366, it was brought out that this experimental program has produced successful results that have exceeded most expectations. A total of 300,000 Federal employees have participated in the program, of whom 90 percent report that they are pleased with the opportunities it provides. In addition, a great majority of the Federal managers responsible for supervising these flexitime experiments express satisfaction with the results.

Flexitime represents an opportunity to make the conditions of employment easier for Federal employees that have families—who are trying to balance the demands of bringing up children with those of fulfilling job responsibilities. In circumstances in which both parents are working, flexitime offers an opportunity to meet both demands, thereby increasing the enjoyment not only of family life but also job satisfaction, with corresponding productivity.

The Federal experience closely parallels private sector activity, where employers have found that they benefit from flexitime and that their employees have more control over their working lives. In particular, flexitime reduces the conflicts between work and personal needs of working women. In the private sector, over 10 million workers in thousands of different firms enjoy flexible schedules and compressed workweeks.

We need to enact this legislation today, to insure that the authority to continue the flexitime experiment will not expire, thus ending one of the most promising personnel innovations in the history of the Federal Government. I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation so that we can continue to provide Federal employees with the opportunities that this legislation would make possible.

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2254.

Several weeks ago, when the committee bill on flexible and compressed work schedules (H.R. 5366) was considered by this body, I pointed out that if we failed to enact legislation continuing these popular programs, that failure would be due to first, the opposition of the administration which wants to remove initiation or termination of flexible schedules from the bargaining table, and second, to attempts in the other body to use the Federal employees' program as a vehicle for enacting nongermane amendments affecting the working hours of some private sector employees. Sadly,

permanent legislation is not before us today for those very reasons.

Although the parties involved have made good faith efforts to resolve their differences, the administration remains adamant that agency heads must have unilateral authority to terminate existing programs. The administration further insists that this authority be totally nonreviewable. The labor organizations, whose programs and collective bargaining agreements would be threatened by such broad authority, understandably object to the administration position. Existing programs were entered into as a result of collective bargaining and are covered by applicable collective bargaining agreements. The law in effect when these agreements were negotiated (as interpreted by the Federal Labor Relations Authority) provides that any termination of these programs is subject to negotiation. The administration now wants Congress to pass a law permitting agency heads to break these negotiated agreements presumably to bail the administration out of some contracts it feels are not in its interest. The administration wants Congress to permit it to abrogate collective bargaining agreements which are signed and sealed.

So, what we have before us today is a bill which would simply extend the existing program for approximately 4 months. If the bill is enacted, these programs will continue.

This morning, we learned the administration is opposed not just to the legislation reported earlier by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but also to S. 2254, a simple 4-month extension, which could provide a cooling-off period during which the parties at odds perhaps could resolve their differences. Now we hear they support S. 2254. I am at a loss to understand the administration's earlier opposition, unless, it really is not serious about continuing this program. We on our side have done everything we can to keep these programs going. If a permanent program is not eventually enacted, Federal employees will understand it is the administration which is to blame for the loss of this popular program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2254.

The question was taken.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks, and include extraneous material, on the Senate bill, S. 2254.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1540

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5014, H.R. 4750, S. 146, S. 2166, H.R. 4709, H.R. 2528, H.R. 5708, and S. 2254, all by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

EXTENDING THE LIFE OF THE GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5014.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SERBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5014, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 30, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—368

Addabbo	Bouquard	D'Amours
Akaka	Bowen	Daniel, Dan
Albosta	Breaux	Daniel, R. W.
Alexander	Brinkley	Daschle
Anderson	Brooks	Daub
Andrews	Broomfield	Davis
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	de la Garza
Anthony	Broyhill	Deckard
Applegate	Burgener	Dellums
Ashbrook	Burton, Phillip	DeNardis
Aspin	Butler	Derwinski
Atkinson	Byron	Dickinson
AuCoin	Campbell	Dicks
Bafalis	Carman	Dingell
Bailey (PA)	Carney	Dixon
Barnard	Chappell	Donnelly
Barnes	Chapple	Dorgan
Beard	Cheney	Dowdy
Bedell	Chisholm	Downey
Beilenson	Clausen	Duncan
Benedict	Clay	Dunn
Benjamin	Clinger	Dwyer
Bennett	Coelho	Dymally
Bereuter	Coleman	Dyson
Bethune	Collins (IL)	Early
Bevill	Conable	Edgar
Biaggi	Conte	Edwards (AL)
Bingham	Conyers	Edwards (CA)
Blanchard	Corcoran	English
Bliley	Coughlin	Erdahl
Boland	Courter	Erlenborn
Bolling	Coyne, James	Evans (DE)
Boner	Coyne, William	Evans (IA)
Bonior	Craig	Fary
Bonker	Crockett	Fascell

H-1052

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 23, 1982

Chappell
Chappie
Chisholm
Clausen
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne, James
Coyne, William
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Deckard
Dellums
DeNardis
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdahl
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IA)
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler
Findley
Fish
Fithian
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fountain
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Grisham
Guarini
Gunderson
Hagedorn
Hall (OH)
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins

Heckler
Hefner
Heffel
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Levitas
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundlin
Madigan
Markey
Marienew
Marriott
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell (MD)
Mitchell (NY)
Moffett
Mollohan
Moore
Morrison
Murphy
Napier
Natcher
Nelligan
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oaker
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Peyser
Pickle
Porter
Price

Pritchard
Quillen
Rahall
Railsback
Ratchford
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts (KS)
Roberts (SD)
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Sabo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shamansky
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Siljander
Simon
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (PA)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stanton
Stark
Staton
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Tauzin
Traxler
Tribie
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Wampler
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber (MN)
Weber (OH)
Weiss
White
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wilson
Winn
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zeferetti

Archer
Broyhill
Burgener
Carman
Cheney
Collins (TX)
Corcoran
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Dannemeyer
Derwinski
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Erlenborn
Fields
Gramm
Gregg

Ashbrook
Badham
Bailey (MO)
Boggs
Brown (OH)
Burton, John
Derrick
Dornan
Dougherty
Eckart
Emery
Ertel
Evans (IN)

NAYS—54
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Hillis
Hyde
Jeffries
Johnston
Latta
Leath
Lewis
Lungren
Martin (IL)
McClory
McDonald
McEwen
Michel
Miller (OH)
Montgomery
Moorhead

NOT VOTING—38

Foglietta
Frenzel
Gejdenson
Green
Hall, Ralph
Hendon
Kindness
LeBoutillier
Lent
Long (MD)
Marks
McCloskey
McCollum

Mottl
Myers
Oxley
Paul
Rangel
Roemer
Rousselot
Rudd
Shumway
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Snyder
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stump
Taylor
Thomas
Walker

McDade
Moakley
Molinari
Murtha
Neal
Pashayan
Pursell
Rhodes
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Russo
Schulze

Daniel, R. W.
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Deckard
Dellums
DeNardis
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erdahl
Erlenborn
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IA)
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler
Findley
Fish
Fithian
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fountain
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gephardt
Gillman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Grisham
Guarini
Gunderson
Hagedorn
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Hefelt
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Horton
Howard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde

Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kastennmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Levitas
Lewis
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Madigan
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mattox
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McClory
McCurdy
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell (MD)
Mitchell (NY)
Moffett
Mollohan
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Mottl
Murphy
Napier
Natcher
Nelligan
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Oxley
Panetta
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Peysner
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Rahall
Railsback
Ratchford

Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts (KS)
Roberts (SD)
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rosenthal
Rousselot
Roybal
Sabo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Shamansky
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Simon
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (PA)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
St Germain
Stangeland
Stanton
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas
Traxler
Trible
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Wampler
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber (MN)
Weber (OH)
Weiss
White
Whitehurst
Whitely
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wilson
Winn
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zeferetti

Mr. CARMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY ALTERNATIVE WORK SCHEDULE EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2254.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2254, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 361, nays 33, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS--361

Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Bafalis
Bailey (PA)
Barnard
Barnes
Beard
Bedell
Beilenson
Benedict
Benjamin
Bennett
Berreuter

Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blanchard
Bliley
Boland
Bolling
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bouquard
Bowen
Breaux
Brinkley
Brodehead
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Burgener
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron

Campbell
Carman
Carney
Chappie
Cheney
Chisholm
Clausen
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corcoran
Courter
Coyne, William
Craig
Crane, Philip
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan

March 23, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1051

EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICABILITY

Sec. 7. (a) The provisions of this Act requiring the promulgation of regulations shall be effective upon enactment.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), the provisions of this Act shall apply to payments made or due on or after the date which is one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each agency which, prior to the effective date specified in subsection (b), failed to make a payment under a contract by the due date of such payment shall make such payment by such effective date. Beginning on such effective date, interest shall accrue in accordance with this Act on any payment which is referred to in the preceding sentence and which is not paid prior to such effective date.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority. *Provided, however,* That any regulations promulgated under the authority of this Act shall not be applicable to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which shall be solely responsible for implementing the provisions of this Act with respect to its contracts.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROOKS moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 1131, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 4709, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Federal Government to pay interest on overdue payments, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4709) was laid on the table.

ECONOMY ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2528, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were: yeas 356, nays 43, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—356

Addabbo	Barnard	Bonior
Akaka	Beard	Bonker
Albosta	Bedell	Bouquard
Alexander	Benedict	Bowen
Anderson	Benjamin	Breaux
Andrews	Bereuter	Brinkley
Annunzio	Bethune	Brodhead
Anthony	Bevill	Brooks
Applegate	Biaggi	Broomfield
Archer	Bingham	Brown (CA)
Aspin	Blanchard	Brown (CO)
Atkinson	Billey	Broyhill
AuCoin	Boland	Burgener
Bafalis	Bolling	Butler
Bailey (PA)	Boner	Byron

Campbell	Hamilton	Oxley
Carman	Hammerschmidt	Panetta
Carney	Hance	Parris
Chappell	Hansen (ID)	Patman
Chapple	Hansen (UT)	Patterson
Cheney	Harkin	Pease
Chisholm	Hatcher	Pepper
Clausen	Heckler	Perkins
Clinger	Hefner	Petri
Coats	Heftel	Peyser
Coelho	Hertel	Pickle
Coleman	Hightower	Porter
Collins (IL)	Hiler	Price
Collins (TX)	Hillis	Pritchard
Conable	Holland	Quillen
Conte	Hollenbeck	Rahall
Conyers	Holt	Rallsback
Corcoran	Hopkins	Rangel
Coughlin	Horton	Ratchford
Courter	Howard	Regula
Coyne, James	Hubbard	Reuss
Coyne, William	Huckaby	Richmond
Craig	Hughes	Rinaldo
Crane, Daniel	Hunter	Ritter
Crane, Philip	Hutto	Roberts (KS)
Crockett	Hyde	Roberts (SD)
D'Amours	Ireland	Robinson
Daniel, R. W.	Jacobs	Rodino
Dannemeyer	Jeffords	Roe
Daschle	Jeffries	Roemer
Daub	Jenkins	Rogers
Davis	Johnston	Rose
de la Garza	Jones (OK)	Rosenthal
DeChard	Jones (TN)	Roth
DeNardis	Kazen	Rousselot
Derwinski	Kemp	Roybal
Dickinson	Kennelly	Rudd
Dingell	Kildee	Sabo
Dixon	Kogovsek	Santini
Donnelly	Kramer	Savage
Dorgan	LaFalce	Sawyer
Dowdy	Lagomarsino	Scheuer
Downey	Lantos	Schneider
Dreier	Latta	Schroeder
Duncan	Leach	Schulze
Dunn	Leath	Seiberling
Dwyer	Lee	Sensenbrenner
Early	Lehman	Shamansky
Edgar	Leland	Sharp
Edwards (AL)	Levitas	Shaw
Edwards (OK)	Lewis	Shelby
Emerson	Livingston	Shumway
English	Loeffler	Shuster
Erdahl	Long (LA)	Siljander
Erlenborn	Long (MD)	Simon
Evans (DE)	Lott	Skeen
Evans (GA)	Lowery (CA)	Skelton
Evans (IA)	Lujan	Smith (AL)
Fary	Luken	Smith (IA)
Fascell	Lundine	Smith (NE)
Fenwick	Lungren	Smith (NE)
Fiedler	Madigan	Smith (OR)
Fields	Marlenee	Smith (PA)
Findley	Marriott	Snowe
Fish	Martin (IL)	Snyder
Fithian	Martin (NC)	Solarz
Filippo	Martin (NY)	Solomon
Florio	Mattox	Spence
Foley	Mavroules	St Germain
Ford (TN)	Mazzoli	Stangeland
Forsythe	McClory	Stanton
Fountain	McCurdy	Staton
Fowler	McDonald	Stenholm
Frank	McEwen	Stokes
Frenzel	McGrath	Stump
Frost	McKinney	Swift
Fuqua	Mica	Synar
Garcia	Michel	Tauke
Gaydos	Miller (OH)	Tauzin
Gephardt	Mineta	Taylor
Gibbons	Minish	Thomas
Gilman	Mitchell (NY)	Traxler
Gingrich	Moffett	Trible
Ginn	Mollohan	Udall
Glickman	Montgomery	Vander Jagt
Goldwater	Moore	Volkmer
Gonzalez	Moorehead	Walgren
Goodling	Morrison	Walker
Gore	Murphy	Wampler
Gradison	Myers	Watkins
Gramm	Napier	Waxman
Gregg	Natcher	Weaver
Grisham	Nelligan	Weber (MN)
Guarini	Nelson	Weber (OH)
Gunderson	Nichols	Whitehurst
Hagedorn	Nowak	Whittaker
Hall (OH)	O'Brien	Williams (MT)
Hall, Ralph	Oberstar	Williams (OH)
Hall, Sam	Obey	

Wilson	Wright	Young (FL)
Winn	Wyden	Young (MO)
Wirth	Wyllie	Zablocki
Wolf	Yatron	Zerfetti
Wortley	Young (AK)	

NAYS—43

Barnes	Hartnett	Paul
Beilenson	Hawkins	Schumer
Bennett	Hoyer	Shannon
Burton, Phillip	Jones (NC)	Stark
Clay	Kastenmeier	Stratton
Daniel, Dan	Lowry (WA)	Studds
Dellums	Markey	Vento
Dicks	Matsui	Washington
Dymally	McHugh	Weiss
Dyson	Mikulski	White
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Whitley
Fazio	Mitchell (MD)	Wolpe
Ferraro	Mottl	Yates
Ford (MI)	Oakar	
Gray	Ottinger	

NOT VOTING—34

Ashbrook	Evans (IN)	Moakley
Badham	Foglietta	Molinari
Bailey (MO)	Gejdenson	Murtha
Boggs	Green	Neal
Brown (OH)	Hendon	Pashayan
Burton, John	Kindness	Pursell
Derrick	LeBoutillier	Rhodes
Dornan	Lent	Rostenkowski
Dougherty	Marks	Roukema
Eckart	McCloskey	Russo
Emery	McCollum	
Ertel	McDade	

Messrs. DAN DANIEL, OTTINGER, MCHUGH, EDWARDS of California, HAWKINS, and WOLPE, Ms. FER-RARO, and Mr. DYMALLY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BOUQUARD changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1640

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT
EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5708.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5708, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 341, nays 54, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—341

Addabbo	Beard	Bonior
Akaka	Bedell	Bonker
Albosta	Beilenson	Bouquard
Alexander	Benedict	Bowen
Anderson	Benjamin	Breaux
Andrews	Bennett	Brinkley
Annunzio	Bereuter	Brodhead
Anthony	Bethune	Brooks
Applegate	Bevill	Broomfield
Aspin	Biaggi	Brown (CA)
Atkinson	Bingham	Brown (CO)
AuCoin	Blanchard	Burton, Phillip
Bafalis	Billey	Butler
Bailey (PA)	Boland	Byron
Barnard	Bolling	Campbell
Barnes	Boner	Carney